

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: Friday, May 20, 1983 10:00 a.m.

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time on a point of privilege, of which I have given your office one hour's notice. The point of privilege I raise is with regard to your decision yesterday, May 19, 1983, regarding the admissibility of certain questions in Oral Question Period.

I feel this matter is very serious, not only for members of the opposition, who certainly ask the majority of questions, but the rights and privileges of backbench members on the government side of the House who wish to ask questions for the interests of their constituents, for the interests of better policy-making in this province. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I feel that the restriction that would be placed upon this Assembly by the decision of your office yesterday, would not be acceptable to leave on the record as it was. So on that basis . . .

MR. KING: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: . . . I raise the point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, what I understand purports to be a point of order is a decision that you made in the Assembly yesterday afternoon, which decision, once made, becomes the property of the House. The opportunity exists for hon. members to appeal those rulings to the House, and that opportunity can be exercised when the ruling is made. The hon. member having failed to exercise the opportunity to appeal the ruling, I'm not sure that a point of privilege exists.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I respectfully suggest the hon. Minister of Education has misconceived what the hon. leader of the Independents is raising. He isn't raising a point of order; he's raising a point of privilege. I received due notice of it, and I propose to hear him out.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for that specific ruling.

The ruling that I refer to is contained in the Hansard [Blues] of May 19, and I'd like to quote that into the record at this point in time. This is you speaking, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the decision:

I have a little difficulty with this. If the hon. Acting Leader of the Official Opposition would refer to *Beauchesne*. I'm sure he'll find in several places that the question period is really not the time for a reach back into history.

That is the concern we have, Mr. Speaker. My colleagues and I believe that question period is a place to

reach back into history, reach back so that we can hold the government accountable for actions which took place in their administration possibly a year back, two years, or three years, but reflect as well on a current situation. I will explain that as I go through my notes today.

We have examples in this Legislature where we did ask questions of history to reflect upon current policy; for example, yesterday in question period the Minister of Agriculture responded to my question with regard to the orange and blue buttons. The occurrence of that incident, when it actually happened, was late 1981 and early 1982. I was questioning a policy decision at that point in time, but it does reflect upon the current actions of government in terms of using public funds in private party expenditures and whether a cross-fertilization occurred. So the question was in order and was asked in this Assembly.

We look as well at the patronage questions which were asked by members on this side a week ago today, Friday. The questions referred to appointments made a number of years ago, and a variety of different appointments were raised during that question period. But the key question was with regard to current policy with regard to patronage by this government. So the historic information was necessary in the question period to bring it into the current context.

A third example which I'd like to cite was prior to 1971. I only make remarks relative to this because yesterday, under points of order, I made the statement with regard to the former Leader of the Opposition Mr. Loughheed and his colleagues asking questions of an historical nature. I would like to cite what I think is a very obvious precedent for the question that was raised here yesterday. The question was asked by Mr. Getty to Mr. Clark, who was the Minister of Education at that time. I'd like to quote the question into the record, Mr. Speaker, to show that it is very historic in nature. This is a direct quote from Hansard in its form at that time, March 5, 1969, page 21. Mr. Don Getty:

A supplementary question Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister aware of any study of a similar nature during the previous 35 years of the Administration?

An historic question. The hon. Mr. Clark stood in his place immediately and responded:

Mr. Speaker, I don't feel that I can comment with a great deal of authority as far as the past 35 years of the administration of the Department of Education.

However there certainly have been from time to time studies into the question of school building costs.

And the answer goes on. But that was a question and answer in terms of an historic perspective, and it was accepted by the House at that point in time. Mr. Speaker, I can go on and quote others, and I'm sure that in speaking to this point of privilege, my colleagues will raise those matters.

Secondly, the decision yesterday must be assessed in terms of the reasonableness of that decision. First of all, I think we must look at this concept of currency, and I've already commented on it. Was the matter raised by Mr. Martin in the question yesterday current or not? Was it raised in the press or on the radio in the last couple of days? As I understand it, the matter the hon. member was referring to was discussed on a radio program on Wednesday of this last week. Does that make it current? It was current in the minds of the public. When we talk about currency, as my hon. colleague raised yesterday, we are talking about five minutes ago, one day ago, 10 years ago, whatever it is. But the concept of currency certainly relates to the necessity of the question to glean informa-

tion. Often you must start from an historical perspective or gain historical information. What that relates to is a sequence of questions that leads up to accountability of government.

The second part of my question of reasonableness is whether the decision becomes restrictive and sets a precedent in this Assembly. I believe it does. To me, that is the most difficult matter to accept. We in the opposition and government backbench members need flexibility in asking our questions, and this ruling certainly does create restrictiveness. It sets a precedent for that restrictiveness, which I can't accept. I must say that if that type of ruling continues in the House, we will have continual confrontation between members of the opposition — and possibly government backbenchers — and the Speaker.

I don't think that our objective in this Assembly — and members of the opposition specifically — is to come here and have arguments and debate with the Speaker of the Legislature. That is not our intent. But if rulings that occur in this Legislature interrupt the opportunity for us to ask questions, to press the government, to hold the government accountable, then our only choice is to focus our attention on the Speaker's Chair. But historically, that is certainly not the role of a member of the Legislature; it's not historically accepted as such. In our own conscience, we don't want that objective. But under the circumstances, when working for the rights and privileges of a member, we have no other recourse but to challenge those actions.

In terms of this decision, Mr. Speaker, I see that there certainly are some choices for you. First of all, as the hon. Minister of Education raised earlier, we could move a motion, because the matter now becomes the matter of the House. But again by precedent and by votes that have occurred in this House — there's only one exception, and that occurred during the time Mr. Art Dixon was Speaker of this Legislature. The government disagreed with his decision and put him in a very awkward position over the weekend. At the Monday sitting he was able to work his way through the maze of difficulty and stay in the Chair, but he put himself in a very vulnerable position. At that time, we as the government could not support him. His alternative and choice was to resign. If government members here felt that we had a good case and voted against a motion put before this House, that would leave one option for you in the Chair. That places a very difficult situation with regard to the motion because, when we place it before this House, in 99 out of 100 cases it's incumbent upon the government to support their colleague who sits in the Chair. That's just about the way it is. So what happens then? Even though as members of government you may disagree with the ruling, we in this House must live with it, and the next House must live with it.

For example, in the last House a decision was made by the Speaker to table certain documents given by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. I don't agree with that decision. But because we accepted it at that time and couldn't do anything about it, it is now a precedent ruling in this Assembly. The Speaker can again, without question, table documents or delay certain questions of privilege, which I believe at that time related to the Premier. I don't agree with that, and we don't want that to happen again at this time, Mr. Speaker.

So that's our first choice. It's not a good one, under the present circumstances. Certainly we can do it, but it's not the right one.

The second choice I see is that with your own con-

science, a clear statement could be made with regard to a misjudgment, a miscalculation, drawing the wrong conclusion under the circumstances, not being able to totally assess the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood's question. That decision could be revised, moderated, and presented again to this Assembly for our concurrence. I'm certain members of this Assembly would be open to that. We are. We've tried to be fair.

That relates to my third option, and that is a redefinition of the decision by you or, certainly, a motion by the Government House Leader that would seem to be acceptable to this Assembly. We would then know that the decision would be supported and approved and be acceptable to the Assembly. Coming from this side, we have this adversary option which I know would leave us with a precedent that none of us could really accept.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that those are three options. I would prefer either the second or the last, so that we continue in an atmosphere of fairness and that our focus does not become your Chair but becomes the matters of this Assembly, which are certainly more important.

Some authorities were cited with regard to your decision. I have reviewed our House rules and do not find anything there that seems to be relevant to the decision or supportive of the decision. It certainly says that there is a question period, but that's as far as the rules go, as I understand them. Other authorities were referred to in this Assembly. In the fifth edition of *Beauchesne*, for example, section 357(1)(l), which wasn't referred to, refers to written questions, not oral questions. The fourth edition of *Beauchesne* referred to oral and written. This refers only to written, so really doesn't even apply in this circumstance, but I will just comment on it very quickly. It says: "seek, for purposes of argument, information matters of past history", and indicates that that is not in order. But in this question, even if we could apply it to the Oral Question Period, we were not seeking for purposes of argument. As I read the question, the hon. member was seeking information to begin a series of questions, not for the purposes of argument.

We look at the other items that were laid before us: sections 358(1)(a) and 359(5). Both these sections in *Beauchesne* refer to matters of urgency. Well, Mr. Speaker, I could very quickly say this: something that is in history does not mean that the matter is not urgent. It certainly can be historical and urgent, and I think we could all argue that very easily. For example, patronage over a period of time at some point in time becomes urgent. Chemical deposits, waste deposits, sanitary deposits — I can think of different examples: the constituency of Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, the airport just south of Edmonton. They were there for some time, but all of a sudden they become evident and the matter becomes urgent — historical but urgent. So certainly that could fit within acceptability in this House. The other question that's been raised in Alberta in the last year, the holocaust of '39-40 and so on, has become a matter of prominence as of this year; historical, it now becomes an urgent issue.

Mr. Speaker, those are some of the arguments I see that indicate that we should review that decision, that we shouldn't allow the decision to become precedent in this Assembly. We as members are just starting a new Legislature and certainly would not want to start with ground rules that will cripple discussion in this House. I can only urge you to review the matter, Mr. Speaker. As mature representatives in this Legislature, let's come to grips with

the matter, with a very mature and responsible attitude.

Thank you.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in rising to make some observations on the point of privilege raised by the hon. Member for Little Bow this morning, I certainly concur in the concerns the hon. member has raised. As I read over the transcript, I don't think there's any question that the issue here is to what extent one can cite historical matters as they relate in a relevant way to current policy.

No one is arguing that members on either side of the House should be able to ask questions about something that happened five, 10, or 20 years ago that has no relevance. But the hon. Member for Little Bow quite properly pointed out that during this current session, there have been a number of issues where history has in fact been raised but as it relates to current issues. He cited a number of cases, and perhaps the most graphic one was the holocaust, an historical event of some 40 years ago. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, it was appropriate that it could be referred to in questions, because those questions are directed towards current government policy with respect to curriculum, the Human Rights Commission, and the position of the government of Alberta on racism in this province. I raised a number of questions with respect to the largest loan in the history of the Alberta Opportunity Company, an \$8 million loan. That loan was authorized in October last year but is relevant to existing policies of this government with respect to loaning procedures.

Mr. Speaker, as I read over the citations in *Beauchesne*, certainly the section in 357(1)(l) that the hon. Member for Little Bow made reference to — "seek for purposes of argument, information on matters of past history" — it seems to me that on the face of it, it could be argued that you can't ask questions. But when one is asking questions in the context of current policy, then it seems to me that the relevance of past history becomes an important consideration. I ask hon. members to note Citation 299 of *Beauchesne*, which says:

Relevancy is not easy to define. In borderline cases the Member should be given the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if we are to carry out our responsibilities on both sides of the House, there are going to be occasions when either government members or opposition members will have to make reference to something that happened in the past. The key is that it be linked to some current policy. Without getting into the specific ruling yesterday, it seems to me that that kind of link is absolutely fundamental if freedom of speech is going to be protected and enshrined in this Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, we are left with the options. As the Member for Little Bow pointed out, there is no doubt that the clearest option would be for us to introduce a motion appealing your decision yesterday with respect to the first question put by my hon. colleague from the constituency of Edmonton Norwood. That could be the opposition designated motion next Thursday. Once again, in a rancorous debate, we would go through the process of discussing your particular ruling. The point that has to be made is that if that motion carries, it is in fact a motion of non-confidence against the Speaker. That's certainly an option, but it is far better that we look at what happened yesterday — even if there was a definition of that particular ruling as it relates to a narrow question — so that we do not set a precedent in this House which will shackle our ability to ask questions in

the future. This is a concern that all four members of the opposition are concerned about at this stage, and I think properly so.

That being the case, the other options that my hon. colleague the leader of the Independents has cited are worth assessment and review. We do not want to get into a situation where we are allowing a precedent to develop which will not only unnecessarily restrict future debate, but when one looks back over the question period of this particular session, there have been numerous examples where you have — quite properly, in my judgment — allowed references to past occurrences. It seems to me that if there is to be any common-sense resolution of this, rather than getting ourselves into an unnecessary confrontation — but that may have to be done — surely the better course is to review the particular ruling itself in the narrowest sense, but not set a precedent which would restrict linking relevant historical information as it relates to current government practices.

If that can be done, Mr. Speaker, I would say that perhaps yesterday's discussion will be but a small chapter in the turbulent history of our legislative activities, and we can go on confident that the abilities of members to do their public duty unhindered will be reinforced and strengthened, not reduced.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one very short comment. It has to do with a section of Hansard [Blues] where we were talking about refereeing. I believe the role of a Speaker, chairman, referee, or umpire is to call them, in many instances, as they appear to be. If we were to go along with a decision that we could not refer to anything that was past history, that would rule out the purchase of PWA, some of the decisions the government made, as it applies to the current situation.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to relate to the Assembly a little for instance of how you sometimes have to call them as they appear to be. This goes back to my years when I was umpiring. The person who was giving the course on umpiring told a true story to the rookie umpires. He cited a case when the Boston Red Sox were playing the Cleveland Indians in a very, very crucial ball game late in the season. There's a man on first, the batter is up and is supposed to be protecting the runner, and the hit and run is on. The hon. Member for Peace River can appreciate this. The runner takes off when the pitcher winds up, but the batter didn't protect him, so the runner is out by 15 feet. As he slides into second, he hooks and the tag is missed. The umpire called him out. The runner came up — dirt flying and the usual choice words that ball players use in that situation — and he said: but Mr. Umpire, he didn't tag me. The umpire said: you know that and I know that, but those 70,000 people saw you out by 15 feet — you're out. The guy got up, dusted himself off, and walked off without any further argument.

Mr. Speaker, the point I'm making is that if your decision will be that we cannot go back into history, that would be an unreasonable decision. People out in the public could not understand that we, hopefully as responsible members of this Assembly, cannot question government on things that happened in the past as they relate to the situation today. The only point I'm trying to make is that the decision you must make must appear to be reasonable, not only to us but to the people in the general public.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, just briefly, with the exception of the hon. Member for Clover Bar, who has

regaled us with one of his charming anecdotes, no doubt out of a great many, I only open by commenting that the other two hon. members of the opposition who spoke have chosen this device to threaten you, Mr. Speaker. That was done, and we all heard it. The question is whether or not . . .

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. That is an accusation that is inaccurate and unacceptable.

MR. NOTLEY: Exactly.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I did not threaten your office in any way, and the House leader should retract that. I was raising options that were available to you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Which the Minister of Education also raised.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I could have brought a motion in this House censuring and attacking your Chair, but I did not. The point of privilege that was brought here left options, and I think those were acceptable options. I think that's an unfair comment, and I want it retracted.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It is true that somewhere in parliamentary lore there is a reference that members should not impute motives to other members, whether they be threatening or anything else. I think sometimes those motives are rather transparent, but that still does not justify a comment on it.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in light of your ruling that the comment isn't justified, I'm pleased to withdraw it.

The point is that we have before us a purported question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, and the decision you must make is whether or not a prima facie case exists. I suggest that is clearly not the case. What has been done is that a number of proposals have been made as to how either the rules in respect of the question period might be changed or, alternatively, how you might apply the existing rules differently, Mr. Speaker. But a great deal of the substance of what was said was based on gratuitous suggestions as to how the rules might be changed: fair enough on any occasion when it's appropriate to raise those matters, but not by way of a question of privilege. Since the hon. Member for Little Bow has chosen to raise the matter in the context of a question of privilege, then what he raises must conform to that. It does not do so. I submit there is no question of privilege in the circumstances.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. leader of the Independents has given proper notice of the point of privilege. He has discussed it at some length; so have the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition and the hon. Member for Clover Bar. I respect the sincerity with which their arguments have been put. However, the fact of the matter is that what we have here is really not a question of privilege but an indirect way of appealing a Speaker's ruling, and of course that does not give rise to a question of privilege.

In fairness to hon. members who have earnestly argued the point, I think I should perhaps make a few further comments. It's true that an airport might have existed for 40 or 50 years and become a proper topic for the question period if within a recent time there is some development in regard to that airport. It's true that the holocaust

occurred a considerable number of years ago, but it could still become a proper matter for the question period in relation to something that has just occurred. Similarly in regard to a loan. Suppose a loan were made in 1971, 1969, or before that, and it turned bad. I suppose if it were that old, it would be bad anyway. But in any event, if that loan turned bad, that would be something recent. If it were a substantial loan and affected a large amount of the public funds, it could conceivably become a matter of sufficient urgency to provide a basis for a proper question in the question period. But when a question is asked which does not indicate present urgency — for example, suppose someone said to a minister, what did you do about child care in 1972? Well, that clearly is not acceptable.

Let's remember one thing about the question period. In some respects, our question periods in most of the parliaments of Canada are somewhat unique, because they permit questions without notice. If we're going to have a whole lot of questions that should be put on the Order Paper, then we're simply wasting time. One after the other, the ministers will say, I'll accept that question as notice, and then look it up — as is occurring anyway to some extent, but it would occur far more. So that kind of question relating to something in the past is not in order. That is probably just speaking to the same effect as I did yesterday, and I'm not purporting to change what I said yesterday.

I was interested to have the opportunity to welcome the hon. Member for Clover Bar to the ranks of the referees. I had not heretofore recognized him as a kindred soul. In that regard, if I may make a few remarks, I am sure he will now understand them perhaps better than most members, but they are intended for the House. Every game has its rules. So have all work places, including this one in this Assembly. To play by the rules is playing the game, and anyone who doesn't want to respect the rules doesn't belong in the game. No referee apologizes for applying rules, and I'm not apologizing either.

I don't make any rules. It's true that I'm stuck with the rulings I make. They belong to the House, and the House may be stuck with them too. The House can change them, and that will not offend me particularly at all. Most rulings are matters of opinion, and there can be many opinions, honestly held, on many points. I'm simply here in the role of a member who has been chosen to serve this parliament and this province by following rules that have already been made. If I refuse to do that, then I've accepted the job under false pretences.

There have been repeated references, inside and outside the House. In that regard, I'd like to assure the hon. members who have spoken on this point of order that they can be quite assured and know that they're totally safe from any comments I might make about them or what they have said to the press outside the House. I will not be commenting about them in that way.

As I said, there have been repeated references to how other parliaments do their work. Those are not in any way comparisons for me to make. I leave those comparisons to those who want to make them, inside or outside the House. If there are people who think other parliaments are more interesting than ours because their proceedings are more disorderly, I say to those people: I do not intend to equal or outdo other Speakers or parliaments in any comparison of degrees of disorder.

Sometime within the next few days I will propose, with the indulgence of the House, to make a somewhat extended statement on the question period. Perhaps I could

indicate in advance, because the statement is partly prepared, that I hope it will become apparent to all members and to those who observe and perhaps even report on our proceedings that in fact our question periods have been running with very substantial latitude. I am not applying the rules strictly. I haven't done that; I don't intend to do that. I apply them merely to the extent of practicality, because there are certain elements of fairness that should apply even to the question period, particularly since it is not a debating period in which all members have the usual opportunity to enter into debate.

I thank the hon. leader of the Independents for raising the point, even though I'm unable to agree that it's a question of privilege. But it has perhaps provided an opportunity to clear the air somewhat.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

Bill 60 **Surface Rights Act**

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 60, the Surface Rights Act. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

Approximately one year ago, almost to the day, the House debated the report of the select committee on surface rights. The select committee, established on May 23, 1980, under the chairmanship of the hon. Member for Barrhead, was charged with carrying out a total review of the policies and legislation related to surface rights in Alberta. Bill No. 60 introduces a number of new concepts designed to meet concerns raised during the select committee's activities and since that time.

Under Bill 60, the onus for giving notice on renewal of surface leases will shift from the landowner or occupant to the energy industry operator. The Bill would also allow for renegotiation of board orders and surface leases, primarily involving well sites, that were entered into prior to 1972. Similarly, it will allow for renegotiation of those board orders and surface leases for major power transmission lines entered into prior to 1977. After the legislation comes into force, and if private negotiations in these cases are not successful, the Surface Rights Act will allow applications to the Surface Rights Board after June 1, 1985, for an order varying the previous orders or lease agreements.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation introduces a new concept: the entry fee. This fee will be a one-time, initial payment by any operator seeking access to the surface of privately owned, deeded land. It will be in addition to any other payments that might be awarded under the compensation process of the Surface Rights Board. In general . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm becoming increasingly uncomfortable in the Chair as the hon. minister makes a very lengthy introduction of a Bill. Might I suggest that it should be done more briefly. I recognize the importance of the Bill, but we don't customarily anticipate second reading debate when introducing Bills.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your ruling. I thought I would take the opportunity to try, considering that it is a very complex Bill.

There are a number of other provisions in the Bill, Mr. Speaker, covering matters including reclamation and sur-

face rights mediators. We expect that the Alberta Surface Rights Act will help ensure that there's a continuing compromise between the two industries.

[Leave granted; Bill 60 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the response to Motion for a Return No. 172.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, this morning I have the privilege of introducing to you and to other members of the Assembly 55 grade 6 students from Vital Grandin school in the city of St. Albert. They are accompanied by teachers Ms Boyko and Mrs. Brueseker; parents Mr. Blackburn, Mrs. Fitzpatrick, and Mr. and Mrs. Barteski; and school bus driver Mrs. Apoll. I ask that they rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce through you to the Assembly four members of the Alberta Auctioneers Association, who had a very good meeting at 7:30 this morning with the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I'd like to introduce president Bob Balog, vice-president Mr. Frank McInenly, past president Bern Scown, and secretary-treasurer Nora Schmidt.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this morning to introduce to you, and through you to all members of the Assembly, 51 grade 6 students from St. Hilda school in Edmonton Mill Woods. They're accompanied by their teacher and principal, Mr. Ron Jiry, and by their other teacher, Mr. Joe Tolvay. They're seated in the public gallery. I'd like them to rise and receive the traditional greeting of the Assembly.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of introducing a second group. I hope they're in the gallery. With the delay in the House proceedings this morning, I think some of the classes stayed a bit longer. But I'll introduce them, as I know they have to leave shortly.

It's a group of grade 6 students from the village of Legal, located at the northern end of the St. Albert constituency. These students are accompanied by teachers Eugene Krupa and Laurent Johnson, and by parents Charlene Weaver and Lee Townsend. I'm advised that they're sitting in the public gallery. If they're there, I ask them to stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, each year the Kinsmen Club of Edmonton honors a group of deserving youths who have shown outstanding leadership or achievement in one or more of the areas of athletics, academics, the arts, and community service. To find these recipients, the Kinsmen solicit nominations from the general public through the schools, churches, community leagues, various organizations, and the news media. This year there were 53 people nominated out of approximately 60,000 eligible youths in Edmonton. Last evening, 46 of the youths received certificates of merit. Four of the youths received the bronze salute to youth medallion, and three received the silver salute to youth medallion.

Mr. Speaker, one of the youths receiving the silver medallion last evening is a page in our Legislative Assembly: Orié Berezan. Some of his achievements are that he's 14 years of age, an honors student, president of the student council, co-editor of the school newspaper, a member of the school band, a volunteer at the General hospital, a volunteer helper to an eight-year-old dependent handicapped student, and he has also won an outstanding student award.

His parents are with us today and are seated in your gallery, Mr. Speaker. I ask that they rise and receive the congratulations of this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: May I second the kind remarks made by the hon. minister and add that in addition to his outstanding accomplishment, our page is gifted with a very deep sense of modesty and humility. Knowing this was coming up, he absented himself. I had to ask him to come back into the Chamber.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, I believe the tour guides have now caught up with the proceedings of the Assembly, and the group that I introduced from Legal has just arrived in the members gallery. Their names are already recorded in *Hansard*, and I ask them to stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Human Rights

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources and ask whether the government is in a position to confirm that subsequent to the granting of National Energy Board approval, arrangements are being made by the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission to export some 460,000 barrels of Alberta light crude oil to Chile, commencing this July.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I can't provide any specific details of that matter. I would have to take it as notice, except to say that we have of course been seeking to market our shut-in light and medium crude oil. Those exports are subject to the approval of the National Energy Board, as a matter of national concern. Beyond that, as to the details I would have to report back to the House on another occasion.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Premier, a supplementary question to the Government House Leader. Yesterday, Amnesty International released a report titled Chile: Evidence of Torture, detailing continuing and systematic torture of political detainees by the Chilean government. I have several copies that I'll file with the Legislature.

My question to the hon. minister is: has the government of Alberta developed any policy with respect to exporting Alberta products to regimes in the world where there is a blatant disregard for human rights?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, that's not a matter I would normally respond to. One of my colleagues would normally deal with matters of trade, and the two ministers most directly involved are not in their places today. I would just respond to the hon. member in a very general way and not purport to attempt to deal with the matter in

the way in which either of my hon. colleagues might. If the hon. member is speaking of whether we would still attempt to have grain sales to the Soviet Union, the answer is yes.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Labour, in charge of the Human Rights Commission. Has the hon. minister asked the Human Rights Commission to examine criteria with respect to human rights and trade that might be provided to agents general throughout the world?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether I correctly understood the direction of the question from the hon. Leader of the Opposition. If I did, I would like to express the view that the Individual's Rights Protection Act lays out quite specifically the responsibilities of that commission. My view would be that the direction in that statute confines the activities of the Alberta Human Rights Commission to complaints arising within the jurisdiction of Alberta which are presented to the commission and, further, to educational programs of a nature designed to increase tolerance, understanding, and respect for human beings, whatever their race, nationality, sex, or religion, among other matters.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either the hon. Minister of Labour or the Government House Leader. In light of Amnesty International asking people to contact the Minister of External Affairs, asking that prior to trade there be conditions imposed with respect to the provision of human rights, has any consideration been given by the government of Alberta to sitting down with federal officials with respect to violation of human rights and Canadian trade?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, again I want to emphasize what I think could be determined from reading the Individual's Rights Protection Act. I don't want to get into the subject of legal interpretations, and suggest that the responsibility of the commission is fairly specific, it is fairly clear, and it relates to the jurisdiction within this province of incidents arising within this province.

Mr. Speaker, in respect of any federal/provincial consultations, which I gather was an aspect of the question raised by the hon. leader, I can only respond that there are occasional meetings of officials. In the last four years, there has been one meeting of federal/provincial ministers responsible for human rights. The discussions generally relate to developments within Canada and to the interpretation or consideration of undertakings and covenants of an international significance, as they affect Canada.

I think that is the only response I could give to the question. I'm not sure that's answered it all, but it's answered all that I can provide within my responsibility.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. As I glean from the minister's answer, there have been occasional meetings of provincial ministers with the federal government. Would the Assembly be correct in taking the minister's answer to indicate that the trade policy as it applies in this Legislature is that a buck is a buck, regardless of who the purchaser is? The minister indicated that international covenants had been discussed at the meeting of federal and provincial officials. Has there been some consideration that human rights violations should in fact be a barrier to trade?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, in trying to respond, I am searching my memory for the exact agenda of a meeting which occurred 19 or 20 months ago, I believe. I am not sure I can do that without checking that agenda specifically. However, I again want to reiterate that I do not believe that the focus of those meetings and, to my knowledge, of the preliminary tentative agenda for the forthcoming meeting, deals with the question of trade and whether there should be trade with countries alleged to be in violation of certain covenants. The ministers responsible for human rights in Canada seem to have found quite a sufficient list of items to keep them fully occupied in discussing matters occurring within Canada, changes occurring within Canada, and various points of view about those.

I would also draw to the hon. member's attention that there is a variety of points of view on whether the welfare and interests of persons in countries where there are allegations of violation of human rights are best served by withholding trade or not withholding trade. It depends, of course, upon one's perception and the degree of injury that may be done by not providing foodstuffs, as a case in point.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the minister's answer may in fact be correct; there may be a difference between foodstuffs and items that could be used for other purposes.

A supplementary question. The minister indicated that a meeting was upcoming. Would the government of Alberta take the initiative in urging that this matter be put on the agenda, in view of Amnesty International's request that Canadians who are concerned about human rights violations contact the Minister of External Affairs, so that there can be very strong notes to whatever country but in this particular case Chile, because of the most recent violations of human rights on a massive scale?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to take the hon. leader's representation as notice.

Government Purchasing Practices

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the hon. Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services. What is the current practice in terms of purchasing cars for the government of Alberta? Are middlemen involved?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, the answer is no, no middlemen are or have been involved. With vehicles under 10,000 g.v.w., the policy is to tender directly from the auto manufacturers. As members can appreciate, this results in very favorable price discounts.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Given the minister's answer about tendering directly, has there been any evaluation by this minister of the reasons some 21 cars were purchased a few years ago, at a profit of about \$3,500 per car, by a firm owned by Mr. McGrath and a former cabinet minister Mr. Dickie?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, the short answer is that they weren't. I've had the opportunity to have my officials check the files and public accounts, and no such transactions were made with either Mr. McGrath or the consulting firm referred to. [interjections]

MR. DIACHUK: Fire your researchers, Grant.

Railway Crossing Accidents

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Transportation is with regard to the VIA Rail dayliner. About a year ago, my colleague asked the former minister with regard to some of the studies and actions the government would take with regard to accidents relative to VIA Rail. Now that the current situation is not going to go into the courts, I wonder if the minister could indicate what actions, if any, have been taken.

MR. M. MOORE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to. I'd like to deal first of all with the general situation with regard to railway crossings, not just VIA Rail. In areas where Alberta Transportation has responsibility — primarily the primary highway system — we've been active in installing new signals over the last year. At present there are some 12 applications to the Canadian Transport Commission for installations we would make. Since January 1, 1983, we've had approval from the CTC for the installation of 11 additional signals. Over the course of the present fiscal year, we expect about 21 additional new signals will be installed at railway crossings where Alberta Transportation has jurisdiction. I should add that in addition to this, there may be numerous ones — and I'm not familiar with the numbers — that have been applied for and will be installed by local governments where they have responsibility for the secondary highway system, or in towns and cities where they have responsibility for roads within the cities.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, we've been involved in the development of a new level crossing sign which we believe will catch the attention of drivers in a more effective way than might have been the case in the past and, in fact, are prepared to begin installing those signs almost immediately but require the approval of the federal Minister of Transport. I wrote to Mr. Pepin on April 8, seeking his personal intervention in the matter so we might get, at the earliest opportunity, federal approval to install a new type of sign which we think will be much more effective in getting driver attention than the old one. In addition, there are a number of driver education programs, such as Operation Lifesaver, that the hon. member might be aware of and that are in place to try to train drivers with respect to the hazards of railway crossings.

I just conclude by saying that the problem really is mostly one of driver inattention to the fact that railway level crossings can be dangerous. We are doing everything we think is reasonably appropriate in order to bring such things to the attention of motorists. I should add as well that during the course of my estimates and during the throne speech debate in this House, I said that it was my intention to place rumble strips leading up to certain selected rail crossings throughout this province so that, again, driver attention might be brought to bear in terms of the hazards that are presented in front of them.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to do with some type of reflectorized striping on the sides of railroad cars. I've made this representation for many years now, Mr. Minister. Has the minister had any discussion with his federal counterpart or the CTC as to what point we're at in making any progress in putting reflectorized tape on the sides of cars so they are visible at night on uncontrolled crossings?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I personally have not had any conversations with the federal Minister of Transport or his officials in that regard; it may well be that officials of the Department of Transportation have. I'd be pleased to check to find out.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question regarding Operation Lifesaver and reflector tape on cars. I direct this to either the Minister of Transportation or the Minister of Agriculture. Would the ministers welcome an opportunity to start reflectorizing the blue hopper cars that the province purchased?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Economic Development isn't here today. Before we allowed the Canadian Wheat Board to control the cars, that minister was the last one responsible. Perhaps we could refer the matter to him.

Public Service Management Salary Rate

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration. It arises from the annual report of the Public Service Commissioner. In view of the fact that on June 1 last year there was a pay increase to management personnel employed by the government, could the minister advise the House whether the government has made a decision affecting management for 1983?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, in June 1982, prior to the federal government announcement of the six and five program, through Executive Council this government established the management pay rates of 6 per cent for the year from June 1, 1982, until May 31, 1983. At the same time, the performance pay system was continued and reduced so that an outstanding performer, a limited number, could receive an additional bonus of up to 2 per cent.

Executive Council has determined the pay rate for the management group of the public service officials, effective June 1, 1983, and the Public Service Commissioner is now advising the deputy ministers of the decision that was just made.

MR. GOGO: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If I heard the minister correctly, there was a settlement of some 10 to 12 per cent with everyone else in the province, but I understand those who were outstanding got 6 per cent if they were in the management category. I find that very interesting.

Reference is made in the report that there is a 6 per cent market increase. I wonder if the minister could tell us whether a 6 per cent market increase is the same as a 6 per cent actual increase.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, the 6 per cent reference in the report deals with the salary range in which each employee is receiving his or her pay. The final adjustment to that employee may not have been 6 per cent but would have been based on performance. Similarly, in this year the management pay raise will be a 5 per cent limitation to each department, based on the payroll of that department. The deputy minister will have to determine whether there are merit, inequities, or performance that would enable the individual employee to receive any adjustment or any number, provided the overall cap remains at 5 per cent.

MR. GOGO: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if I may. I believe the minister said, effective June 1. Recognizing the effectiveness of computers, I'm sure many of those managers who work for the government would be interested if the minister could advise when they might actually receive that pay increase for 1983.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, there are about 3,900 employees affected by the decision. Given the ability of the computer system and payroll systems, it's expected that it would likely be done in the month of June, since the decision is in the process of being conveyed to the deputy ministers at this time. However, I should indicate that as each deputy minister will have to review how the decision will be applied — because the decision must take into account the overall limit of 5 per cent and any inequities or performance — it may not; it may be that some period of weeks may be involved. But certainly they would be backdated until June 1, 1983.

Volunteer Participation in Universiade

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister responsible for Personnel Administration. I was going to address it to the Member for Calgary McKnight, but I believe he had to catch a plane. Can the minister indicate or is he aware of the fact that the Research Council is authorizing up to 10 days' leave with pay per employee to work at the university games? Is the minister in a position to indicate if that has been part of government policy or if that is made just by the Research Council?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to respond in the House for the Alberta Research Council. The member is in and is available. Perhaps on his behalf I would indicate that the member's comments as to his whereabouts were not correct. He is away from the House on business at this moment, and perhaps could respond on a future question day.

With regard to the Commonwealth Games, the Universiade, or other important events of that nature, I could say generally, though, that employees in the private and public sectors have in fact given, continue to give and, we hope, will give their volunteer efforts. The Boy Scout jamboree coming up in Kananaskis Country in my own constituency is another example of a worldwide event where the success of the event depends upon the contributions of thousands and thousands of volunteers.

Our position as a government, and I assume the Alberta Research Council as an agency may consider a similar policy, is that where employees wish to volunteer their time — and thank goodness many people do — we encourage the employees to do so. Many of them do it on occasion on their own vacation time. We encourage that, if people wish to do it. Many people take time off without pay. There are some situations, though, where refereeing or special events are such that it may be possible for the employer to grant time off and the employee will make it up later. We leave it to each employer to decide, and I'm glad that the employees continue to offer their services in that way.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. I'm not disagreeing that we need the volunteers. The broader question is: is it a general policy of government that all departments similar to the Research Council have been given a notice that they will be allowed

up to 10 days' leave with pay if they are selected to serve as volunteers on the university games?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice and get back, as I don't have access at this moment to discuss with my colleague whether he has given a notice. I will have to take that question as notice and get back to you as soon as I can.

Mortgage Company Bankruptcy

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Attorney General, if I can get his attention. Will the Attorney General confirm that he has undertaken legal proceedings which are intended to prevent Dial Mortgage creditors from suing the government of Alberta?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that the issues there were the other way around. There was a lawsuit in which a receiver on behalf of some creditors, in any event, took proceedings against the Crown. I consider the matter to be before the courts at the present time and would not respond in detail on any of the issues involved.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. I'm not asking for the particulars of the case. Is it true that he has undertaken legal proceedings which are intended to prevent Dial Mortgage creditors from suing the government of Alberta?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is asking if counsel on behalf of the Crown has gone so far as to defend the action, the answer is yes.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Would the Attorney General advise when he expects to hear the court's decision?

MR. SPEAKER: Surely we're getting a bit beyond the bounds of the question period. Perhaps the hon. member might direct his question to the judge.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, then. In view of the government attempt to block Dial creditors from their day in court, will the Attorney General at least support my reference of the matter to the Ombudsman?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Ombudsman, I responded previously in the Assembly to that matter and indicated that my view was that there was no jurisdiction on the part of the Ombudsman to do that. Hon. members may recall that the issue was discussed at that time in light of what was said to be a precedent in another province. Beyond what I responded to at that time and in connection with those same matters, I have no further response today.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the hon. member, I want to intervene briefly and point out that the question period is really not a time to be snide. I want to make it clear that although I didn't comment, I wouldn't want some of those things to be taken as precedents.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the Attorney General. As I understand it, the government is saying no court action should take place and no Ombudsman

inquiry, because he doesn't have the right. What then is the policy of the government with respect to having the claims of Dial creditors resolved to their satisfaction? Is there a policy at all?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Ombudsman may well have jurisdiction at a point when the matter is not before the courts. At the present time, my understanding is that it still is. I indicated to the hon. member just a moment ago that what has occurred is that the Crown has been sued and has defended the action. Without going into what the proceedings are, I am aware of certain steps being taken on behalf of Her Majesty in respect of this particular suit. But, Mr. Speaker, the mere fact that a defendant defends does not create suspicious circumstances in any lawsuit.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. In view of the fact that some Dial creditors have lost their entire life savings, if the court case is ruled against them what would then be the government policy to help these people?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hypothetical.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I respectfully suggest to the hon. member that he might review some of the usual practices which apply to the question period, one of which says that hypothetical questions should not be taking up the time of the House.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the fact that Tower Mortgage, as of earlier this week, is not honoring securities which have come due, will the minister advise what measures she will take to protect the claims to their securities of Tower Mortgage investors before it is again too late?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, that matter is before the Securities Commission. Until I have information on their investigation and the ultimate outcome of that investigation, I don't have a comment.

Volunteer Participation in Universiade (continued)

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, before we go to Orders of the Day, I wonder if I could just mention for the benefit of the Member for Clover Bar that I was out of the House on Research Council business. I will report back to him on the matter of leave for Universiade, through the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have received certain messages from His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, which I now transmit to you.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order!

MR. SPEAKER: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor transmits estimates of a certain sum required for the service of the province for the 12 months ended March

31, 1983, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor transmits estimates of certain sums required for the service of the province for the 12 months ending March 31, 1984, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor transmits an estimate of a certain sum required from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund for the 12 months ending March 31, 1984, for the purpose of making investments pursuant to section 6(1)(a) of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act in projects which will provide long-term economic or social benefits to the people of Alberta but which may not necessarily by their nature yield a return to the trust fund, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor transmits supplementary estimates of certain sums required for the service of the province for the 12 months ending March 31, 1984, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

Please be seated.

head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could the Committee of Supply please come to order.

Department of Public Works, Supply and Services

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the minister wish to make some comments?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, the 1983-84 capital budget of the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services provides \$224.2 million for capital construction projects. These projects will provide a direct benefit to approximately 75 Alberta communities and, of course, indirect benefits will accrue to many more areas of the province. In order to ensure that citizens of Alberta receive the maximum benefit possible from public works programs, every effort will be made to use local contractors and materials wherever possible.

I would also like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that while the total capital construction budget for '83-84 is \$224.2 million, the total value to completion of the projects contained in this budget amounts to approximately \$1 billion. The decrease in the inflation rate, coupled with highly competitive bidding, should ensure that the activity level of construction and the number of jobs involved will make a significant contribution to the construction industry in Alberta and be at last year's level. This budget demonstrates our commitment to providing the public facilities necessary to deliver the programs of this government to the citizens of Alberta and, at the same time, demonstrates this government's commitment to fiscal responsibility.

The supply and services portion of this year's budget is \$150.1 million, and the major thrust is a hold-the-line approach. No new program initiatives or major enhancements have been planned and, with the exception of increases related to non-discretionary items of space and utilities, all price and volume increases have been absorbed within current funding levels.

Mr. Chairman, the prime objective of the department continues to be to deliver high quality service with economy, efficiency, and effectiveness. We will be seeking increased productivity through the introduction of innovative techniques, such as office automation, automated information systems, and further contracting of services to the private sector. In particular, an additional \$1.12 million of caretaking and maintenance services will be contracted to the private sector and, for the first time in Canada, building management services will be contracted. These measures will benefit Albertans across the province.

Mr. Chairman, the government of Alberta currently operates a Douglas DC-3 aircraft which was manufactured in 1943. The advanced age of this aircraft and the increasing difficulty in obtaining parts and reliable engine overhaul precludes its continued use beyond 1985. This is a work aircraft and is used extensively in the fire suppression program for transporting personnel and equipment to remote locations not serviced by commercial air lines. The province owns and operates only one large service aircraft of this kind, which is needed to meet the minimum base requirements of the field service work. All other large aircraft, including water bombers, are contracted from private contractors. It's our intention to replace this aging aircraft with a de Havilland Dash 8, which we've ordered to be delivered in 1985. The aircraft will cost \$5.7 million — that's '81 Canadian dollars — and will be capable of transporting a full, standard, 28-personnel fire crew plus equipment. Depending on load, the range will vary from 800 to 1,100 nautical miles, with a speed of 300 miles per hour. I might add that the Dash 8 is a totally Canadian-made aircraft.

Mr. Chairman, I think this concludes my overview of the budget. As we proceed through the estimates, I'd be pleased to answer questions concerning any details of the budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments?

Agreed to:

1.1.1 — Minister's Office	\$198,400
1.1.2 — Deputy Minister of Public Works	\$233,200
1.1.4 — Administrative Support	[\$2,908,800]
1.1.5 — Personnel	\$249,500
Total Vote 1.1 — Public Works Support Services	\$3,589,900
1.2.1 — Administrative Support	\$547,435
1.2.2 — Management Services	\$1,130,024
1.2.3 — Financial Services	\$961,272
1.2.4 — Personnel	\$1,240,939
1.2.5 — Metric Conversion	\$268,518
Total Vote 1.2 — Supply and Services Support Services	\$4,148,188
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$7,738,088
Total Vote 2 — Building Operations and Maintenance	\$99,201,616
3.1 — Administrative Support	\$4,422,000
3.2 — Provision of General Purpose Space	\$117,550,000
3.3 — Grants in Lieu of Taxes	\$22,750,000

Total Vote 3 — Planning and Acquisition of Accommodation	\$144,722,000
4.1 — Administrative Support	\$11,943,900
4.2 — Advanced Education	\$16,140,000
4.3 — Agriculture	\$1,180,000
4.4 — Attorney General	\$20,860,000
4.5 — Tourism and Small Business	\$895,000
4.6 — Culture	\$18,070,000
4.7 — Energy and Natural Resources	\$8,840,000
4.8 — Environment	\$1,425,000
4.9 — Executive Council	\$33,430,000
4.11 — Education	\$1,805,000
4.12 — Labor	—
4.13 — Recreation and Parks	\$1,710,000
4.14 — Social Service and Community Health	\$9,865,000
4.15 — Solicitor General	\$20,825,000
4.16 — Transportation	\$3,420,000
4.17 — Public Works, Supply and Services	\$59,750,000
4.18 — Hospitals and Medical Care	\$8,845,000
4.19 — Multi-Departmental Services	\$5,200,000
Total Vote 4 — Planning and Implementation of Construction Projects	\$224,203,900
Total Vote 5 — Operation and Maintenance of Waterlines	\$1,226,300
6.1 — Information Services	\$963,292
6.2 — Telecommunication Services	\$34,981,613
Total Vote 6 — Information and Telecommunication Services	\$35,944,905
Total Vote 7 — Government Transportation	\$5,550,815
Total Vote 8 — Supply	\$5,214,938
Total Vote 9 — Financial Assistance to the Calgary Olympic Coliseum	—
Departmental Total	\$523,802,562

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, I move that the vote be reported.

[Motion carried]

Department of the Solicitor General

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. minister wish to make any comments?

MR. HARLE: Just a brief comment, Mr. Chairman. I would refer hon. members to a couple of ministerial statements that I believe cover the major items, and one or two answers in the question period that might be of importance. Beyond that, I'd be interested in hearing comments.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, if I could, I'd like to just throw out some ideas to the Solicitor General about what I perceive as a serious problem developing. I've mentioned from time to time, specifically in my riding, that I consider it perhaps the number one issue. It certainly is with the older people in the riding, especially when you go door-knocking, as most of us did during the election

campaign. You see retired people who are so afraid that they almost barricade themselves in their houses as soon as the sun goes down.

This is a tragedy when people have contributed all their lives and then at the tail end of their lives, it is like they are in their own prison. It is a serious problem and not one that can be easily answered. Unfortunately in Edmonton, I think there are reasons. We are in the boom and the bust. I mentioned to the Solicitor General that our violent crime rate of 1,100 per 100,000 people is almost double the 600 per 100,000 people Canadian national average. I know we can play with figures; I'm not going to bother with that. Mr. Chairman, I think the Solicitor General would agree that we are facing a serious problem, regardless of the figures.

How do you deal with the crime rate? We know it's there. What is the most effective way of trying to stop crime, to protect people in their own homes and the streets in the city? There doesn't seem to be an easy answer; some of the old answers don't work. You can't hire enough policemen to stop crime; it's just impossible. We can't expect policemen to solve all our crime problems, as inevitably we do. Of course people get frustrated because the police are busier and busier. For example, we know that there's been a cutback in the number of policemen in Edmonton, so they don't get there right away and people are upset with them. I don't feel this is fair to our police force.

We did some research into pilot projects or experiments in North America and what seems to be working. I throw these out to the Solicitor General as some ideas. He may wish to take them up and research them a little further. I think there is some merit because they are actually working in certain parts of North America. The reason I introduced the community crime prevention Bill is simply to allow the Solicitor General's Department to basically fund and set the leadership for certain municipalities. Obviously municipalities, local governments cannot afford to get into many programs, even pilot projects. They are just not going to do it if it costs any money. So we are asking the Solicitor General's Department to set up what we called a community crime prevention division.

Mr. Chairman, the main purpose of this is administering the provincial funding for the neighborhood policing program. The other main purpose would be to spend some time circulating throughout other parts of North America certainly, and other parts of the world, to find out how they are dealing with crime and to see if it can be applicable to our province. We suggest these would be staffed primarily with people possessing a community work program. I suppose some police experience would be great too. We'd leave the funding up to the community crime division — but to set the leadership to look at what is happening in terms of crime in many part of the world.

I suggest that if the Solicitor General would take a look at a concept like this, Mr. Chairman, I don't see it costing a lot of money. I know it won't be done this year, but I throw it out as an honest attempt to look at it.

We saw three areas — but there are many more — where things seem to be working. It comes back to the Neighbourhood Watch which is springing up in many places in Edmonton. That's a good first step. The indication we have seems to be that the only place you can deal successfully with crime is where you get the community involved. Too often in our cities — and this is not just true in Alberta; it's true in North America — we've gone our own separate ways: that's somebody else's problem.

Of course, if we are not prepared to help our neighbors as we used to in small towns, not prepared to band together to solve crime, that's when crime thrives.

From the research we've done, the answer seems to be to bring it back to the community level. Neighbourhood Watch, where we are involved helping each other, looking out for their property when they're gone, is certainly a good first step. These sorts of things are an excellent first step. In Detroit, which was called murder city, they even took it a step further. They got the police involved and went back, if you like — partially similar to what Calgary is doing — to the neighborhood policing concept, back to the policeman on the beat. The police were right in the community, part of the community. That changed their role somewhat in the sense that people began to know them as people. There was a social work aspect to the policing. It wasn't a matter of the police just driving through in a car in the sort of punishing aspect of the police role, which is necessary. They began to know all the people, the people they could trust in the area. They became a friend, if you like. They were involved very much in Neighbourhood Watch in Detroit. But they didn't work out of downtown; they worked right out of the community. They worked in church basements in some cases, in community halls, wherever. They didn't need to build extra buildings in the area.

I'm sure we're all aware, Mr. Chairman, that they used to call Detroit murder city. In some of the roughest areas of Detroit, they've had a remarkable decrease in violent crime. They had over 50 per cent of the people signed up with the policemen in Neighbourhood Watch. I know this falls under Municipal Affairs. That's why we were talking about community crime. They could at least discuss this and have new ideas with municipalities if they wanted to go into it. But I think we have to move back, if you like, to the neighborhood policing concept and tie that into Neighbourhood Watch.

One of the things we advocated during the election was a community board, a pilot project. This does not cost money. The pilot project is going on in San Francisco. Apparently we're getting more information now. When we started talking about it in the election, it was very new. They were sort of encouraged, as people always are in new projects. But there seems to be some evidence that it's working. For the Solicitor General's information, I understand the Edmonton Social Planning Council, some of the aldermen, and the police force in Edmonton are looking at this particular concept and think it has some merit. My understanding is, if I'm not incorrect, that some people in the Solicitor General's Department may be looking at it. If that's the case, that's excellent. I think it has a lot of merit. It's not something you can have everywhere right away. It should be a pilot project, perhaps set up in Calgary or Edmonton and one rural area.

The purpose of that community board project was — they found many things that occur in a neighborhood are allowed to build up, even in some of the tougher areas in San Francisco where they're working with it. So they go to the communities and set up a sort of quasi-judicial board, if you like. If neighbors have a dispute or, as I see in my riding sometimes, older people are fighting with a group of younger people next door, they can take it to this board and try to resolve it before it gets to a serious stage or to the formal court stage. The most up-to-date reading I have is that it seems to be working. The evidence indicates that at least some of the petty types of crimes are starting to fall in those areas.

Mr. Chairman, I won't go on much longer. I know there are probably other projects throughout North America and other parts of the world that are working. But I just say to the Solicitor General, if they are looking at these projects, good. I think there are many areas. I wish they would look at the community crime area that we're talking about, because I think the only way we're going to deal with crime is to bring it back down to the community level. That saves some frustration with police. It puts a recognition that their resources are only limited. We can't have a policeman on every block; it's just too expensive.

With those few words, I leave it with the Solicitor General and hope that there will be a good airing of a lot of the new ideas coming out, specifically in North America. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. I'd like to tell the Solicitor General one or two things that concern me. I just want to know if the government has entirely given up on some type of rehabilitative program for people in our correctional institutions. The reason I preface it by saying, has the department given up, is that I have seen the situation in Fort Saskatchewan go from where the people who were incarcerated could be kept busy practically all day every day, to where they have practically nothing to do but watch television.

If the hon. minister wants to look at *Hansard* several years back, when Helen Hunley was the hon. minister in charge, I brought to the attention of the minister at that time that there was really no incentive, no desire, to do even such mundane things as harvest the peas, carrots, and potatoes on the correctional institute property. Some of my sources say the next thing is going to be that we're going to have food catered. I don't know if it's developed to that point or not. But surely we can do better than just incarcerate.

I have made the approach to the government many times that previous to the recession, the industries in our community were more than willing to take people on a day-work program, and accept the fact that some of them were going to take a little premature leave. When you talk to the city police officers or the RCMP, they say that's no problem; we can have these people back within a matter of a few hours because we know where they are; we know where they gravitate; we know what their habits are; we can have them back. So people taking off from work parties is never any big deal.

I'd just like to indicate to the Solicitor General that when I first went to my community of Fort Saskatchewan, the inmates did practically all the street cleaning, all the sidewalk cleaning, all the brushing on the golf course, all the snow removal on the skating rinks. Now they do nothing, absolutely nothing. So I would like to know what the minister's department proposes to do when they open the new institutions. Are they just going to be places of incarceration? Or are they going to make some genuine effort to give these people some training, be it a small amount, be it for a short time?

I'm sure the minister knows that what we have at Fort Saskatchewan now is practically non-existent. I think there are basically about two programs. I know the tenure of the inmate's stay in the institution is very, very short. But surely it's much better that some of the people in there be out planting the garden, taking the crop off, doing some of these things, getting involved in the community, than to be just penned up, wondering which soap program is coming on next. I would like to say to

the Solicitor General, if he's got — as the young people say — any jam, maybe we would like to see some direction from the Solicitor General to try to institute some programs in our institutions. I won't go on, because I could go on and on and I promised I'd be short.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

I have one or two questions I'd like the minister to answer for me. In light of the fact that under the youth offenders Act, there's a requirement that these offenders be housed under separate institutional facilities, I'd like to know what the minister is going to do about fulfilling that obligation. Are we going to look at the renovation of some of the present institutions, maybe some of the areas of the Fort Saskatchewan facility that are still relatively new and in relatively good shape? Are we just going to bulldoze everything out there, or are we going to save the taxpayers some money and use some of the facilities that are there? They are still functional. When we're talking about restraint — I'm sure the \$40-odd million we're going to spend in Grande Cache is welcome to that community. But we can't be putting facilities into certain communities just because we want to solve a local situation. I'm trying to say to the minister as sincerely as I can that I think we can make some use of the facilities that are still in Fort Saskatchewan. If we are genuinely interested in saving some taxpayers' dollars in a time of supposed restraint, we can make use of some of those facilities. We still have property in the Fort Saskatchewan area in the right of the Crown.

If Fort Saskatchewan were chosen to still use some of those facilities, I would like to see some of these young people who are incarcerated involved in some of the community programs. I would volunteer to the Solicitor General to take one or two of these boys. If you have a tree farm, you have a lot of weeds. I think it's not only important that these people have something to do, but I also think it's important for them to come and sit at my table or your table and be treated like human beings. This may be the first time that some of these young people have been treated like fellow human beings.

I think there's a great opportunity for the Solicitor General to move into some new and innovative programs. They're not new and innovative; it's just a matter of reinventing the wheel in many cases. Nothing is that new or different. It's just time for it to come back up from the bottom to the top. I say that if we're going to save some of these people, then I think there's some hope for the young offender.

With those few brief remarks, Mr. Chairman, I say to the Solicitor General that I think he has a great opportunity to do something new and innovative. I wish him well, because I think the opportunity is there.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Chairman, I welcome the opportunity to rise in the estimates of the Solicitor General, to address some comments and perhaps put forth some views on an important issue for the city of Red Deer. The remand centre controversy has lingered in Red Deer since well before the provincial election last November. At the moment, there's a fairly concrete proposal emerging. The basic tenets of the proposed remand centre are before the public. It's a controversial issue in my constituency. Today, I intend to clarify as best I can the nature, size, location, and function of the proposed facility.

Before I do, Mr. Chairman, I think some background leading to the current situation will assist my upcoming

remarks. The origin of the issue was a reference in the budget address by the Provincial Treasurer on March 18, 1982.

The provincial correctional services will be expanded through the addition of new correctional centres in Red Deer and Medicine Hat. These centres will have a multipurpose detention and remand accommodation for men and women. Planning will commence in 1982-83.

The planning funds allocated for the Red Deer correctional centre were \$150,000.

In speaking to his budget estimates on April 19, 1982, the Solicitor General stated:

We'll be starting on a multipurpose facility for Red Deer, and \$150,000 is provided in the budget of Housing and Public Works to start the planning for that facility. We're not sure yet as to the number of inmates that should be housed there. I received letters from the RCMP operating the lockup in the city of Red Deer saying that they were very overcrowded. We'll be providing a lockup and probably a remand facility, with some beds for the short-term inmates, particularly inmates who, by judicial order, are having to serve their sentences on the weekend. We've obviously got to have some provision in the city of Red Deer to handle central Alberta. That particular facility will probably be somewhere adjacent to the court facilities. But if that is not possible or for some reason not convenient, I suppose it could be located in the general area of Red Deer.

Mr. Chairman, subsequent to those very clear comments made in the House, speculation on the size, location, and nature of the facility became a much discussed topic in the city of Red Deer. While I was not a member of this Assembly during that time, it seemed reasonable to me that the Solicitor General's Department would embark on a number of plans and studies to identify the needs of a correctional facility for the city of Red Deer. It's my understanding that these studies, at very best, oftentimes amount to an awful lot of guesswork, because we're dealing with changing circumstances. We're dealing with judges who change the type of sentencing they provide. We're dealing with different types of classification of inmates and the separation of inmates.

The controversy heightened after a number of media reports indicated that a medium-security prison accommodating up to 300 persons was being considered. A prime location for such a facility would be Crown-owned land adjacent to a residential subdivision. This publicity, as you can probably appreciate, prompted a fair amount of controversy and the formation of a concerned group of citizens — and I believe rightfully so — who started a petition opposed to a medium-security prison located near their neighborhood. I attended the public meeting of that group two days after the election. At that time, I advised the group that whatever facility was finally going to be determined, I had serious reservations about locating a prison in or near a residential area.

During that time, I've considered very carefully the socioeconomic benefits of a large medium-security prison within the city limits of Red Deer. While I can see certain benefits, certainly economic benefits, I have not been able to determine a location for a large prison that would not encroach upon existing residential land or, in fact, residential land that may be planned in the future. I suppose I relate particularly to the aspect that if we have any success in the relocation of the railway, there are plans for new residential land in the northwest quarter of the

city.

Based on that, I sent this letter to the Solicitor General on April 28, 1983.

In the period of time since the November election I have carefully considered the proposed correctional centre for the City of Red Deer. Based on the information available to me, I have sought input from a number of interested groups who would have a direct or indirect involvement in a correctional facility as well as many constituents. The input received from the R.C.M.P., the Mayor and members of Council, the John Howard Society, the Chamber of Commerce and others has clearly indicated that a need exists in Red Deer for a Remand/Detention Centre. The present downtown lock-up is inadequate to safely handle the volume of over 300 prisoners per month.

As a side note, last month the downtown lockup in Red Deer accommodated 391 inmates.

A new facility to replace the existing police holding cells and provide adequate remand and detention accommodation is necessary for the City of Red Deer.

I would urge that any facility being built in the City follow the normal planning process including the application for rezoning and development permit. Through this process the citizens will be afforded the opportunity to express their views through the normal channels of the Municipal Planning Commission.

Mr. Chairman, the Solicitor General has agreed to my urging that the facility will follow the normal planning process and has publicly pledged that the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services will apply for a development permit which will indeed ensure ample opportunity for public input on the land use in Alberta.

I think it's noteworthy to make mention of circumstances that happened not too long ago in the Department of the Solicitor General. In his capacity as the minister responsible for the full provincial jurisdiction, obviously he must provide correctional facilities throughout the province to serve the needs of the citizens of this province. He endeavored to do that in the city of Edmonton, and he went through the normal planning process and was denied a building permit through the development appeal board in Edmonton. So that facility could not be there, and he agreed with the ruling of the development appeal board.

There is a way that the minister can sort of solve his problem, and it falls under section 150 of the Planning Act. It's called special planning areas. It provides that

- (1) The Lieutenant Governor in Council may by regulation establish any area of Alberta as a special planning area.
- (2) If the Lieutenant Governor in Council establishes a special planning area he may, with respect to the area, by regulation,
 - (a) prohibit or regulate and control the use, development or occupation of land or buildings ...

He certainly has the opportunity to build the facility wherever he wants. I'm very pleased that the Solicitor General has agreed to allow the normal planning process to carry on in Red Deer, in order that the citizens will receive ample input in the process.

The Solicitor General and I attended a public forum last Wednesday in Red Deer. At that forum the petition, that had really started back in November 1982 and had

been circulating for some six months, was presented. The petition carries 6,000 names and certainly indicates there is concern in Red Deer over a remand or correctional facility. I must confess, however, that I was a little perplexed with respect to the petition, because while there were about 150 people at the public meeting, when asked, only about 30 people put up their hands indicating they had signed the petition. I suppose it's indicative of the fact that early on in the campaign with the petition, people felt they were dealing with a large medium-security prison. Now that we have a definite proposal in front of them, I'm hopeful many of those people will recognize that we're really dealing with a remand detention centre. Nevertheless, I'd be deluding myself to think that there aren't some legitimate concerns, but perhaps some of the concerns can be reduced by providing ample and adequate information as to the type of facility available.

In conversation not long ago with my benchmate the hon. Dr. Carter, he advised me that in Calgary the remand centre has some 275 beds and is located just half a block from a senior citizens' self-contained apartment holding about 200 people, and that no problems have existed since the time of construction.

I would now like to outline and enumerate, if you will, some of the essential elements of the proposed facility. First, the new correctional facility will be a remand detention centre, with a capacity of 104 persons in individual rooms, broken down into different classifications. In the first area, the minimum-security unit will have a capacity of 20 inmates. These are non-violent, non-security types of inmates, non-risk people who are nearing their sentence and are often assigned to community residential areas or are serving an intermittent sentence over the weekends. Typically they are allowed to maintain their jobs, stay near their homes, and stay off welfare.

The other component is the remand detention unit, which will house 32 remanded men, 24 detention men, and 12 women who are either remanded or on detained status. These people are normally detained for a very short period of time, often only 24 hours, and are fresh arrests or, in some cases, are remanded into custody awaiting trial. They are accused people, but they have not been sentenced and their rights must be protected.

The third end of the facility will provide for 16 beds for young offenders. As the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood has just mentioned, the new law provides that separate facilities be provided for young offenders. My understanding is that the 16 units in the Red Deer facility for young offenders will be remand and detention, and these individuals will not be serving full sentences at that institution.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to stress basically two points before I conclude. The proposed location of the facility is directly adjacent to the new regional courthouse in Red Deer. It will have a direct linkage to the courthouse for secure transportation of inmates. It will become a part of the regional judicial complex in the city of Red Deer, and it will eliminate the constant shuffling of Red Deer people, often young adults, oftentimes our own children, to and from Calgary. It will free our police in Red Deer to do their job as opposed to shuffling inmates back and forth. The current situation in downtown Red Deer is inadequate. I believe the lockup has some 10 or 11 cells, and I'm told that as many as 40 people can be incarcerated there at any given time on a weekend. It's an unsafe situation, and it requires RCMP personnel to transport inmates to and from the courthouse by van or

across the street, where the opportunity of escape is rather great.

I would also stress that in light of the recent events in the Solicitor General's Department by virtue of the fact that the department was denied a building and development permit in Edmonton, his agreeing to go through the full planning process in Red Deer is certainly indicative of his feelings toward the concerns of Red Deer. I'm pleased that he has agreed to follow the regular development process, and I look forward to working with him, in concert, to ensure that we can provide as much information as possible to the citizens of Red Deer so they are fully aware of the intentions of this new correctional facility and that there will be ample opportunity for community input in what I think is a needed and important contribution to the judicial system in the city of Red Deer.

Thank you.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I want to deal very briefly with one issue in particular. There are a number of topics that I would like to discuss with the minister at another time, but one issue that comes up every year, in fact twice a year as I hold my meetings with community association presidents and their public service directors, which they ask me to bring back to the Legislature regularly, is compulsory testing of automobiles. I asked this of the hon. Solicitor General last year, and his research indicated that most accidents are not caused by automobile failure. Still, on the part of my constituents, or at least the community leaders in my riding, there is a definite feeling that there are hazards caused by a lack of vehicle testing, that there needs to be a second look at this particular problem, and that we have to look at not only the accidents directly caused but indirect potential problems as well.

So I'd ask the Solicitor General again to look at that possibility and respond either today or when he has time. I do so on behalf of those community association presidents who raise it with me regularly at meetings in our community.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would the Solicitor General like to respond?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Edmonton Norwood raised some very good points about crime prevention. I would indicate to him that in Vote 3, the department has about \$740,000 for crime prevention work. We call it innovative policing. The reason for that is to be able to make use of various types of innovative programs developed by police forces throughout the world in trying to prevent crime. I think hon. members are aware of the crime stoppers program, which is based upon community support and seems to have a good profile at the present time. Most prevention programs are targeted towards specific problems. Officials in the department continually survey the work done in crime prevention in the United States, Great Britain, and elsewhere, so we are continually looking at programs and bringing them to the attention of various police forces throughout the province.

With regard to the questions by the Member for Clover Bar, I feel that the corrections service is providing a great deal of work and programs for inmates; for example, our temporary absence program which allows inmates out of the institution to work at regular jobs. Last year's annual

report shows that there were 119,000 man-days of work done under the temporary absence program. Of course we raise vegetables and garden produce in the facilities at the Fort, and also at the Lethbridge facility.

We have moved the trades for young people out to St. Paul. There are four or five trades available there. It is designed for young people so that we separate them from the general population and the people who are idle and want to stay that way. I recognize the concern that he expresses. I would point out, for example, that on any one day we have around 3,000 inmates in our system, of which about 45 are still in the system for non-payment of fines. We have got these people to work to pay off fines, and over \$900,000 was paid off by fine defaulters through our fines options program.

There are a number of things that we're having a great deal of success with. There is no doubt that we need to do more. The only carrot-and-stick approach that we have is with our incentive-pay system, which pays from \$2 to \$5 a day to inmates. I really think it is time that we increased those incentives for inmates to give them some encouragement, but so far we have not. It is a carrot-and-stick approach. So far, with the temporary absence program particularly, I think we have a better mechanism when we put young people out in the work force at regular work sites rather than at manufactured work sites within an institution.

The MLA for Red Deer covered a review of the procedures going on right now for the new remand and detention centre in Red Deer. As he covered it extremely well, I don't think I need add anything more. It was an excellent meeting in Red Deer this week, and hopefully we'll just await the outcome of the application for the development permit.

The Member for Calgary Currie raised the subject of compulsory testing. I indicated in the past the concern that I have, based on the traffic statistics and the implication of those statistics. I know that the hon. Minister of Transportation, who more properly has the safety side of motor vehicles, will be interested in his comments. Responsibilities for road safety really fall into his portfolio.

Thank you.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, the minister didn't make any comment on the question I raised about using some of the more modern existing facilities in Fort Saskatchewan as part of the youth offenders incarceration program. I would like to know the minister's comment on that.

I want to make one other comment and question the minister on the Check Stop program. Mr. Minister, through the Chairman, I think the program on Highway 16 has probably done a lot of good in trying to control that so-called death highway. I would like to pay a very high compliment to the officers on that patrol. I have been stopped several times, with no complications except that it seems whenever I'm driving that highway, that's about the time I kick my shoes off — which I have found out is illegal. I said: officer, it seems that every time there's a Check Stop program, I'm driving barefooted, but it certainly feels good. Luckily I don't have to step out in my bare feet. But without their knowing who I was — I might have been treated worse — I have never been treated with anything but exemplary courtesy. I would like the Solicitor General to pass that on to the Check Stop people, especially on Highway 16 west. They do it very businesslike, and still they do it very understandingly. They make a point that we're out here trying to save people's lives. I would like to compliment them again.

At the same time, Mr. Minister, I would like to say that I think it's about time citizens got a lot more involved than we are. We saw the report the other day where two young men, who only had a couple of beers — and nobody ever has anything more than a couple of beers — were passing on the right side on what they call the suicide shoulder, hit two young cyclists, and the girl was killed. It is really time that we as citizens showed our responsibility and turned some of these people in. We are past the time when we can expect our police force to do everything for us. I think it would be a great time for us to start doing something in that direction.

It might be very interesting if we as citizens just take a licence number down and drop a letter to the Solicitor General's Department. Mr. Solicitor General, I have done that several times — not a citizen's arrest or a charge. But it's very interesting to see what reaction you get from the person when you've taken a licence number down and the policeman shows up and says, we have had a complaint. This guy turns a little pale, thinking he hadn't seen a cop — and I have a son-in-law, so I can call him a cop — his mouth drops about that far open, and he wonders who saw him cause the infraction.

So I think it's time we get this preventative program into place and put some publicity out saying: Mr. Citizen, you have a responsibility; you have a duty. We are our brother's keeper, but we may also be required to be our brother's informer, because we are being our brother's keeper when we do that.

Also on the Fort Saskatchewan situation, Mr. Minister, what are we going to do with the staff presently there when that institution is phased out?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments by the hon. member with regard to the conduct of officers who conduct the Check Stops. I think the whole program is based on getting a very courteous effort out on the roadside, and I'm glad to see that that is in fact the case.

With regard to the young offenders' facilities, my ministerial statement on the young offender program indicated that officials in the Department of the Solicitor General and the Department of Social Services and Community Health are in fact surveying facilities that are suitable for the young offender program. A decision will be made shortly as to which facilities will come over to the Solicitor General's Department in order to meet the requirements of the young offender legislation.

We will probably be needing additional facilities. For example, we will be having some beds for young offenders at the Red Deer remand and detention facility; the same at Medicine Hat. Of course there will be a need for facilities. When we know the numbers of young offenders who might require closed or open custody, we'll have a better handle on being able to plan our facility program.

The existing Fort Saskatchewan correctional institution is to be replaced, and I'm hoping we can find a site. We tried to get a site once. I'm hoping we will get a site in, shall we say, the immediate Edmonton-Fort Saskatchewan area, so that none of the individuals who presently reside in the Fort Saskatchewan area need move. That's one of the objectives, and that was one of the reasons for the site that was applied for in the northeast Edmonton area.

It's a little too early to say what will be done with the facility after that move is made. It may be that we will need the facility at that time. That will be some years down the road. The hon. member will be aware of the town's interest in the property. They obviously would like

to — I know the hon. member speaks about removal of railway trackage. I don't know whether that will happen, but it does provide some congestion for the community. They have also indicated . . .

DR. BUCK: Not removal — re-routing.

MR. HARLE: Well, re-routing to somewhere. Right.

The community itself is interested in the land and space that would be available were we to find a satisfactory site for the new institution.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Chairman, I beg your forgiveness for rising again. I'll be very brief, in the hope that I don't get inundated with a bunch of notes. I have one more question that I failed to ask the minister.

Mr. Chairman, could the minister advise what plans are being made to reduce the apparent discrepancies between the funding for police contracts through municipalities that contract through the RCMP, as opposed to municipalities that contract through their own municipal police force? I'm told that under the recent contract, the municipalities that have the RCMP under contract are now paying up to 82 per cent of the cost on a shared basis. There seems to be a widening in terms of funding. I'm not fully conversant in it, but I wonder if you could address your thoughts to that area and advise if consideration is being given to lessening that anomaly.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Chairman, the city of Red Deer is policed by the RCMP under a municipal contract. At the time we entered into the current 10-year RCMP contract with the federal government, the federal government indicated that they were very anxious to get out of municipal policing down the road somewhere. One area they would be interested in would be communities the size of Red Deer getting their own police force and not having an RCMP contract. Undoubtedly that will become a greater issue at the end of the current contract. We are looking at this matter.

A different funding arrangement is available for communities with RCMP contracts as opposed to communities that have their own police forces. We're aware of the historic basis for the difference in funding, and we are looking at it to see whether the anomalies, as is always the case in funding mechanisms, have developed to a point that we have to find some way of changing the mix. Obviously, because of the general restraint and the 5 per cent increase in policing grants, this year the municipalities that have their own police forces are finding that their costs are going up at a faster rate than the grants we are providing.

Agreed to:

1.01 — Minister's Office	\$193,800
1.02 — Deputy Minister's Office	\$138,500
1.03 — Finance and Administration	\$1,935,800
1.04 — Personnel	\$1,874,900
1.05 — Computer and Research Services	\$2,263,800
1.06 — Liquor Licence Review Council	\$152,700
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$6,559,500
2.1 — Program Support	\$3,901,400
2.2 — Institutional Services	\$56,201,350
2.3 — Community Correctional Services	\$9,489,200
2.4 — Community Residential Centres	\$2,038,200

2.5 — Native Courtworkers	\$1,525,600
Total Vote 2 — Correctional Services	\$73,155,750
3.1 — Program Support	\$1,262,800
3.2 — Financial Support for Policing	\$82,609,600
3.3 — Highway Motor Patrol	\$3,967,000
3.4 — Federal Gun Control	\$439,700
Total Vote 3 — Law Enforcement	\$88,279,100
4.1 — Program Support	\$7,575,900
4.2 — Licence Issuing and Accident Claims	\$26,567,150
4.3 — Operator Licence Control	\$933,400
Total Vote 4 — Motor Vehicle Registration and Driver Licensing	\$35,076,450
Total Vote 5 — Control and Development of Horse Racing	\$4,800,000
Department Total	\$207,870,800

MR. HARLE: Mr. Chairman, I move that the votes be reported.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure 1982-83

Agreed to:

Department of Advanced Education

Total Vote 2 — Assistance to Higher and Further Educational Institutions	\$6,500,000
Total Vote 4 — Financial Assistance to Students	\$10,720,000

Department of Advanced Education and Manpower

Total Vote 2 — Assistance to Higher and Further Educational Institutions	\$15,986,844
Total Vote 3 — Manpower Development and Training Assistance	\$2,000,000

Department of Agriculture

Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$5,085,000
Total Vote 2 — Production Assistance	\$53,984,000
Total Vote 3 — Marketing Assistance	\$11,910,000

Department of the Attorney General

Total Vote 2 — Court Services	\$793,140
Total Vote 3 — Legal Services	\$60,780
Total Vote 4 — Support for Legal Aid	\$1,987,522
Total Vote 7 — Crimes Compensation	[\$158,500]

Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs

Total Vote 4 — Regulation of Securities Markets	\$685,000
---	-----------

Department of Culture

Total Vote 2 — Cultural Development	\$6,015,359
Total Vote 3 — Historical Resources Development	\$100,000
Total Vote 5 — 75th Anniversary Celebrations	\$32,000

Department of Economic Development

Total Vote 2 — Financing — Economic Development Projects	\$5,600,000
--	-------------

Department of Education

Total Vote 3 — Regular Education Services	\$912,000
---	-----------

Department of Energy and Natural Resources

Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$18,893,235
Total Vote 3 — Minerals Management	\$39,000,000
Total Vote 4 — Forest Resources Management	\$75,656,345
Total Vote 11 — Oil Sands Research Fund Management	\$220,660
Total Vote 12 — Petroleum Marketing and Market Research	\$659,000

Department of the Environment

Total Vote 2 — Pollution Prevention and Control	\$36,144,000
---	--------------

Executive Council

Total Vote 7 — Energy Resources Conservation	\$250,000
Total Vote 9 — Multi-Media Education Services	\$644,100
Total Vote 10 — Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Response	\$3,417,000
Total Vote 11 — Public Service Employee Relations	\$350,000
Total Vote 12 — Financing of Native Venture Capital Corporation	\$2,000,000
Total Vote 13 — Public Affairs	\$879,000

Department of Government Services

Total Vote 5 — Public Affairs	\$844,576
-------------------------------	-----------

Department of Hospitals and Medical Care

Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$1,550,000
Total Vote 2 — Health Care Insurance	\$25,408,000
Total Vote 3 — Financial Assistance for Active Care	\$106,806,465
Total Vote 4 — Financial Assistance for Long-Term Chronic Care	\$10,600,071
Total Vote 5 — Financial Assistance for Supervised Personal Care	[\$6,204,264]

Department of Housing

Total Vote 3 — Alberta Heritage Fund Mortgage Interest Reduction Program	\$20,000,000
--	--------------

Department of Housing and Public Works

Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$150,000
Total Vote 9 — Alberta Heritage Fund Mortgage Interest Reduction Program	\$79,615,000

Department of Manpower

Total Vote 3 — Manpower Development and Training Assistance	\$17,150,000
---	--------------

Department of Municipal Affairs

Total Vote 2 — Financial Support for Municipal Programs	\$24,724,233.38
---	-----------------

Department of Public Works, Supply and Services		Organizations and Agencies	\$710,000
Total Vote 2 — Building Operations and Maintenance	\$3,335,000	Total Vote 11 — Finance and Administration	\$6,669,335
Total Vote 6 — Information and Telecommunication Services	[\$2,021,500]	1.21 — Assistant Deputy Minister — Planning and Evaluation	\$155,980
Total Vote 7 — Government Transportation	\$255,000	1.22 — Student Evaluation	\$4,320,288
		1.23 — Planning Services	\$2,880,224
		1.24 — Computer Systems and Data Base Management	\$2,697,850
Department of Recreation and Parks		Total Vote 12 — Planning and Evaluation	\$10,054,342
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$1,700,000		
Total Vote 2 — Recreation Development	\$11,100,000	Total Vote I — Departmental Support Services	\$16,723,677
		2.1.1 — Provincial Contribution to the School Foundation Program Fund	\$804,853,200
Department of Social Services and Community Health		2.1.2 — Supplementary Requisition Equalization Grants	\$28,377,000
Total Vote 2 — Social Allowance	\$82,016,000	2.1.3 to 2.1.23 — School Regulation Grants	\$103,627,460
Total Vote 3 — Child Welfare Services	\$3,288,430	Total Vote 2.1 — Grants to Schools	\$936,857,660
Total Vote 9 — General Health Services	\$6,504,500	2.2 — Grants to Private Schools	\$11,013,522
		2.3 — Early Childhood Services	\$51,310,031
Department of Tourism and Small Business		2.4 — Educational Opportunity Fund	\$20,443,888
Total Vote 2 — Development of Tourism and Small Business	\$175,000	2.5 — Special Assistance to School Boards	\$47,011,866
Total Vote 4 — Alberta Heritage Fund Small Business and Farm Interest Shielding Program	\$88,598,033	2.6 — Learning Disability Fund	\$4,226,038
		Total Vote 2 — Financial Assistance to Schools	\$1,070,863,005
		3.1 — Program Development	\$6,785,705
Department of Transportation		3.2 — Program Delivery	\$22,597,400
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$460,000	Total Vote 3 — Education Program Development and Delivery	\$29,383,105
Total Vote 2 — Construction and Maintenance of Highways	\$48,040,000	Department Total	\$1,116,969,787
Total Vote 4 — Construction and Maintenance of Airport Facilities	\$1,150,000		
		MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, before moving the vote, could I make four brief corrections to the earlier record? My responses to a question regarding the financial situation of our education system made reference to provincial comparisons of local property tax support of schools. I would like to add that the local property tax support of schools in Alberta is on average the lowest in Canada of those provinces where a comparable provision for local supplementary requisition exists. There are a couple of provinces to which a comparison cannot be made.	
Treasury Department		Also, Mr. Chairman, my discussion of the extended practicum made reference to the new program development fund of the Department of Education. That should have been the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower.	
Total Vote 3 — Revenue Collection and Rebates	\$6,000,000	In response to questions on the Kratzmann report, I informed hon. members that I had endorsed recommendations 3 through 10 of the report. That should have been 2 through 10.	
Total Vote 4 — Financial Management, Planning and Central Services	\$900,000	Mr. Chairman, my discussion of the upward extension of the principles of ECS into the primary grades included a reference to a discussion between the Calgary board of education and the Department of Education. That should have been the Calgary Roman Catholic separate school board.	
Department of Utilities and Telecommunications		Finally, my explanation for the reduction of incremental grants in 1983 as compared to the 1982-83 forecast indicated that these grants were unique one-time	
Total Vote 2 — Gas Utility Development	\$5,000,000		
Total Vote 3 — Natural Gas Price Protection for Albertans	\$9,827,174		
Total — Supplementary Estimates	\$864,066,731.38		

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that the estimates be reported.

[Motion carried]

Department of Education

Agreed to:

1.1.1 — Minister's Office	\$280,400
1.1.2 — Deputy Minister's Office	\$266,109
1.1.3 — Assistant Deputy Minister — Finance and Administration	\$152,680
1.1.4 — Financial Services	\$1,758,780
1.1.5 — Administrative Support and Information Services	\$956,424
1.1.6 — School Business Administration Services	\$612,807
1.1.7 — School Building Services	\$1,418,935
1.1.8 — Personnel Administration Services	\$324,400
1.1.9 — Communications	\$188,800
1.1.10 — Educational Grants to Individuals,	

payments. They were unique time-certain payments, which will decrease to zero over a period of five years.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the vote be reported.

MR. MARTIN: I just have one question dealing with the local supplementary grants. You are saying Alberta is the lowest except for two provinces that you cannot get figures on? Is that correct? What are those two provinces?

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, one of them is New Brunswick. I can't recall the other province at the moment, but I'll undertake to provide that information to the hon. member.

[Motion carried]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration and reports the following resolutions, and requests leave to sit again:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, sums not exceeding the following for the departments and purposes indicated:

For the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services: \$7,738,088 for departmental support services, \$99,201,616 for building operations and maintenance, \$144,722,000 for planning and acquisition of accommodation, \$224,203,900 for planning and implementation of construction projects, \$1,226,300 for operation and maintenance of water lines, \$35,944,905 for information and telecommunication services, \$5,550,815 for government transportation, and \$5,214,938 for supply.

For the Department of the Solicitor General: \$6,559,500 for departmental support services, \$73,155,750 for correctional services, \$88,279,100 for law enforcement, \$35,076,450 for motor vehicle registration and driver licensing, and \$4,800,000 for control and development of horse racing.

Resolved that sums not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1983: \$4,052,000 for the office of the Chief Electoral Officer; \$6,500,000 for the assistance to higher and further educational institutions vote under the Department of Advanced Education, \$10,720,000 for the financial assistance to students vote under the Department of Advanced Education; \$15,986,844 for the assistance to higher and further educational institutions vote for the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower; \$2,000,000 for the manpower development and training assistance vote under the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower; \$5,085,000 for the departmental support services vote under the Department of Agriculture; \$53,984,000 for the production assistance vote under the Department of Agriculture, \$11,910,000 for the marketing assistance vote under the Department of Agriculture; \$793,140 for the court services vote under the Department of the Attorney General, \$60,780 for the legal services vote under the Department of the Attorney General, \$1,987,522 for the support for legal aid vote under the Department of the Attorney General, \$158,500 for the crimes compensation vote under the Department

of the Attorney General; \$685,000 for regulation of securities markets under the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs; \$6,015,359 for cultural development under the Department of Culture, \$100,000 for historical resources development under the Department of Culture, \$32,000 for the 75th Anniversary celebrations vote under the Department of Culture; \$5,600,000 for financing — economic development projects under the Department of Economic Development; \$912,000 for the regular education services vote under the Department of Education; \$18,893,235 for the departmental support services vote under the Department of Energy and Natural Resources, \$39,000,000 for the minerals management vote under the Department of Energy and Natural Resources, \$75,656,345 for the forest resources management vote under the Department of Energy and Natural Resources, \$220,660 for oil sands research fund management under the Department of Energy and Natural Resources, \$659,000 for the petroleum marketing and market research vote under the Department of Energy and Natural Resources; \$36,144,000 for the pollution prevention and control vote for the Department of the Environment; \$250,000 for the energy resources conservation vote under Executive Council, \$644,100 for multimedia education services under Executive Council, \$3,417,000 for the disaster preparedness and emergency response vote under Executive Council, \$350,000 for the public service employee relations vote under Executive Council, \$2,000,000 for the financing of Native Venture Capital Corporation vote under Executive Council, \$879,000 for the public affairs vote under Executive Council; \$844,576 for the public affairs vote under the Department of Government Services; \$1,550,000 for departmental support services vote under the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care, \$25,408,000 for the health care insurance vote under the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care, \$106,806,465 for the financial assistance for active care vote under the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care, \$10,600,071 for financial assistance for long-term chronic care under the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care, \$6,204,264 for the financial assistance for supervised personal care vote under the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care; \$20,000,000 for the Alberta heritage fund mortgage interest reduction program under the Department of Housing; \$150,000 for the departmental support services vote under the Department of Housing and Public Works; \$79,615,000 for the Alberta heritage fund mortgage interest reduction program vote under the Department of Housing and Public Works; \$17,150,000 for the manpower development and training assistance vote under the Department of Manpower; \$24,724,233.38 for financial support for municipal programs under the Department of Municipal Affairs; \$3,335,000 for the building operations and maintenance vote under the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services, \$2,021,500 for information and telecommunication services under the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services, \$255,000 for the government transportation vote under the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services; \$1,700,000 for the departmental support services vote under the Department of Recreation and Parks, \$11,100,000 for the recreation development vote under the Department of Recreation and Parks; \$82,016,000 for the social allowance vote under the Department of Social Services and Community Health, \$3,288,430 for the child welfare services under the Department of Social Services and Community Health, \$6,504,500 for the general health services vote under the

Department of Social Services and Community Health; \$175,000 for development of tourism and small business under the Department of Tourism and Small Business, \$88,598,033 for the Alberta heritage fund small business and farm interest shielding program under the Department of Tourism and Small Business; \$460,000 for departmental support services under the Department of Transportation; \$48,040,000 for construction and maintenance of highways under the Department of Transportation, \$1,150,000 for construction and maintenance of airport facilities under the Department of Transportation; [\$6,000,000] for the revenue collection and rebates vote under the Treasury Department, \$900,000 for financial management, planning and central services under the Treasury Department; \$5,000,000 for the gas utility development vote under the Department of Utilities and Telecommunications; \$9,827,174 for the natural gas price protection plan for Albertans under the Department of Utilities and Telecommunications.

For the Department of Education, resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, sums not exceeding the following:

\$16,723,677 for departmental support services, \$1,070,863,005 for financial assistance to schools, and \$29,383,105 for education program development and delivery.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report and the request for leave to sit again, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday — Monday being Victoria Day — it is proposed that the Assembly sit in the evening. Pursuant to the rule, the government has designated one hour on Tuesday afternoon for government business. It is proposed at that time to call the Legislative Assembly estimates, followed by the Department of Treasury if there's time. The present intention is not to sit Thursday evening, but that could be dealt with further next week.

[At 1 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]